

Remarks

In the previous response the applicant characterized the invention in a section titled "The Applicant's Invention". The Applicant erred. The invention is not limited by said section of the previous response, and has not been so limited at the time the response was filed. The invention is (and was) limited only by limitations presented in the claims.

Status of Claims

Claims 2-10 and 12-28 are pending.

Independent Claims 21 and 22 and dependent claims 4-10, 12, and 14 are amended.

Independent claims 23 and 24 and dependent claims 25 to 28 are added.

The Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims and the new added claims add no new matter.

Rejections under U.S.C. 35 §112

Claims 2-10 and 21 stand rejected under U.S.C. 35 § 112 first paragraph because they refer to "portals", while the disclosure does not mention portals. The applicants respectfully submit that the written description requirement is fulfilled in regard of the term "portals" when the application is considered as a whole. Nevertheless, to simplify prosecution, the claims are amended not to use the word "portal".

Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 stand rejected under U.S.C. 35 § 112 second paragraph for reciting "the identification code" without antecedent basis. Applicant replaced throughout the claims the term "session ID" to the term "session identification code" to point out that the referred code is not necessarily the same as what's known in the art as "session ID". These amendments are merely cosmetic and do not change the scope of the claims. The applicant respectfully submits that in view of these amendments, the rejection is moot.

Claims 7 to 10 stand rejected under U.S.C. 35 § 112 second paragraph for reciting "the identified session" without antecedent basis. This term is replaced with "original session", in accordance with the kind suggestion of the Examiner. The applicants respectfully submit that this amendment does not change the scope of the claims.

Patentability of the new claims

New independent claims 23 and 24 recite a feature of *associating the session ID to a process, which was created by a process operated by the original session*. This process is referred to in the claim as a "child process". While the term "child process" does not appear in the specification, the concept appears, for instance, in the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the application as filed, which states:

While operating within the system ***processes can create additional processes***, producing a hierarchical structure of processes at the kernel level.

By referring each process to the hierarchical tree it belongs to the system can associate the session identification criteria to each process."

(Emphasis added).

None of the cited references teaches or suggests associating a session identification codes to such a "child" process.

Wood discusses only associating identifiers with sessions, and not with processes, certainly not with "child processes" created by a process operated by the original session.

Carter discusses only associating user ID to processes, and does not relate to ***session*** identification codes.

Thus, none of the cited references teaches or suggests the aforementioned feature.

Carter focuses on identifying security events while they happen, while Wood focuses on gatekeeping resources from unauthorized accesses. At least because of this difference between the problems that the two references seek to solve, it would not have been obvious for a skilled person to combine their teachings. Furthermore, even if combined, the combination does not necessarily yield associating a session identification code to a process, and certainly does not yield associating a session identification code to a "child" process.

New dependent claim 25 adds to claim 24 that the association of a session identification code to a child process includes *producing a hierarchical structure of processes at the kernel level; and referring each process to the hierarchical tree it belongs to*. The applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature, and at least for this reason, claim 25 is patentable over the cited art.

New dependent claim 26 is patentable at least for the virtue of being dependent on patentable claim 24.

New dependent claims 27 and 28 are patentable at least for the virtue of being dependent on patentable base claims (21 and 22, respectively), as discussed below. In addition, these claims recite associating the session identification code to a "child" process,

and the applicant respectfully submits that claims 27 and 28 are patentable over the cited art at least for this reason also.

Independent claims 21 and 22 are patentable over the cited art

Independent Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under U.S.C. 35 §102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al (US 2004/0210771, hereinafter Wood). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 22 as amended recites the feature that *one or more processes carried out in the server's operating system is associated with a session identification code*. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is novel over Wood at least because Wood does not teach or suggest the aforementioned feature.

Wood does not discuss associating IDs to processes carried out in the operating system of the server. At most, Wood discusses only associating IDs to sessions, and checking if the trust level associated with the session is sufficient to allow access to a resource. Wood does not mention associating an identification code to any process, certainly not to a process running on the operating system of the server. In fact, the only processes mentioned by Wood are those of the client user entity, for example, in paragraph 31; and the server's operating system is not mentioned by Wood even once. The session in Wood relates only to communication between the client and the server, not to a process running on the operating system of the server. Thus, the aforementioned feature is not taught or suggested by Wood, and at least for this reason, the anticipation rejection of the claim over Wood is moot.

The applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest the aforementioned feature, and that amended claim 22 is patentable over the cited art at least for this reason.

Independent claim 21 recites the aforementioned feature in language pertaining to a system, and the applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is patentable over the cited art at least because of this reason.

The dependent claims are patentable over the cited art

Each of claims 2-10 and 12 to 20 depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 21 or on claim 22 discussed above, and thus is patentable at least for the virtue of being dependent on

a patentable base claim. Nevertheless, the applicant discusses the patentability of some of the dependent claims independently of the patentability of the base claims.

Claims 4-6 and 14-16 are rejected under U.S.C. 35 section 103 as being unpatentable over Wood in view of Carter (US 2003/0051026). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 14 recites the following feature: "the association of the session identification code to the additional process comprises adding an identification code of the original session to the process information vector". The applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references teaches this feature.

The Office acknowledges that the aforementioned feature is not disclosed by Wood.

However, the Office contends that paragraph [0432] of Carter teaches this feature. The applicants respectfully traverse. Paragraph [0432] teaches using *a matrix* to associate various IDs with various processes, and not *adding an identification code of the original session to the process information vector*, as recited in claim 14.

The applicant respectfully submits that this is another reason for which claim 14 is patentable over the cited art.

Claim 4 contains the aforementioned feature, in language pertaining to system. The applicant respectfully submits that this is another reason for which claim 4 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 5 and 15 contain the following feature: "the session identification code replaces redundant information in the process information vector". The Examiner did not consider this limitation; therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness was presented against claim 5 or against claim 15 (see MPEP. 2143.03).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously

solicited.

If there any fees in addition to those being paid herewith for this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account 504438.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael Kondoudis/

Michael Kondoudis
Reg. No. 42, 758

**The Law Office
of Michael E. Kondoudis**

888 16th Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
202-349-9850